

Proponent Testimony on House Bill 61
House Civil Justice Committee
Meredith Meeks Veltri, Ph.D.
Assistant Director of Forensic Services, Netcare Access
March 12, 2019

Good afternoon, Chairman Hambley, Vice Chair Patton, Ranking Member Brown, and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss House Bill 61, and thank you to Representatives Lanese and Liston for their work on this bill.

My name is Dr. Meredith Veltri, and I am the Assistant Director of Forensic Services for Netcare Access. I conduct forensic psychological evaluations and provide expert opinions to courts in Ohio. I am also a former law enforcement officer of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Over the course of my career thus far, I have evaluated many violent individuals, and therefore take steps to maximize my safety and that of my family.

Due to my line of work, I routinely search for my information online so that I can monitor what is available, and take steps to keep that information out of the reach of people who may wish me harm. I easily accomplished this when I lived in other states- and I have lived in six other states. However, in Ohio, I learned that my voter registration information, including my home address, is a matter of public record. I contacted the Secretary of State's office, and I was informed that this was written into statute. I was told that if I wanted to change whether people could find me at home, I would have to change the law. This is why we are here today.

The Ohio Revised Code designates individuals who can be exempted from having their voter registration information included in public record. These individuals include "a peace officer, parole officer, probation officer, bailiff, prosecuting attorney, assistant prosecuting attorney, correctional employee, or federal law enforcement officer," among others. Forensic evaluators, probate pre-screeners, and employees of regional psychiatric hospitals are notably absent from this list. This omission does not make sense, given that we work with the exact same population as these designees- that is, individuals involved with the courts.

It is not difficult to find personal information about nearly anyone online. There are numerous web sites that readily provide home addresses. Although many of these sites provide some circuitous route to having one's information removed, in Ohio, the information is readily re-populated since those sites often draw their information from voter registration records. As such, there is presently no measure that would prevent a vindictive defendant from easily locating me or my family. This exposes us to unnecessary risk that far outweighs any need someone might have to contact me at my home.

It is true that most violence is not perpetrated by individuals with mental illness. It is also true that some individuals with mental illness are at increased risk for violence. We are tasked with offering expert opinions that have significant implications for the disposition of criminal cases, and defendants are sometimes displeased with the opinions that we offer to the courts. Whereas we understand that we are providing an important service to the courts, defendants often perceive that we are simply acting against them. Some respond by threatening us and our families.

In 2017, I conducted a forensic psychological evaluation of an individual with multiple felony charges in Ohio. When the police conducted a search of the defendant's vehicle, they located voter registration

information for several people. The defendant had located and printed the home addresses for numerous individuals involved in his case. He used that information to threaten an officer and his family members, slash the tires and break the windows of vehicles belonging to court officials, and set a fire on a judge's property. That information could easily have contained my address or the addresses of my colleagues or our family members.

In terms of what this bill does, it quite simply would allow mental health professionals who work with mental health evaluatees (predominantly those in forensic settings) to petition public offices to remove or redact our home addresses, and those of our family members. That's all.

With regard to what House Bill 61 does not do, it in no way restricts an evaluatee's due process rights, nor does it place limitations on an evaluatee's ability to contact us at our places of employment. For example, court orders and subpoenas are delivered to our places of employment, where we also get phone calls from attorneys and evaluatees. This bill will not impact such processes. Importantly, this bill in no way interferes with our obligation to provide evaluatees with the contact information that they need should they choose to advance a complaint against us based upon our evaluations.

I understand the importance of being accessible and transparent about my work within the confines of the law, and with regard to ethical and professional guidelines. However, this can be accomplished without compromising my safety, or that of my family. We fully accept our need to be responsible and take reasonable steps to safeguard our personal information, including our digital footprints on social media. What we need your help with is keeping personal and private information private. If someone has questions about the work that I do, they are welcome to contact me at my place of business. However, placing the precise location of my family into the hands of individuals who may wish them harm simply makes no sense to me and is unacceptable. This legislation bears no expense, and provides a measure of common sense protection by closing a dangerous loophole. As such, I ask that you vote yes on House Bill 61, and afford us the same protections offered to others who work with the same population.

I will be happy to address any questions you may have. Thank you for your time.